

Notes on Meeting
Steering Committee for the Survey of State Library Agencies
September 10-11, 1997

The Steering Committee for the Survey of State Library Agencies met on Wednesday, September 10, and Thursday, September 11, 1997, at the Hotel Sofitel, 1914 Connecticut Avenue, NW in Washington, DC. Mr. Shubert called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

Present were: Adrienne Chute (NCES), Patricia Garner (Bureau of the Census), Thomas Jaques (COSLA, State Library of Louisiana), Carrol Kindel (NCES), Elaine Kroe (NCES), Keith Curry Lance (FSCS Steering Committee, Colorado State Library), Libby Law (Data Coordinator, South Carolina State Library), John Lorenz (NCLIS), Mary Jo Lynch (ALA), John Medina (Bureau of the Census), Kate Nevins (ASCLA, Executive Director of SOLINET), Gerry Rowland (Data Coordinator, State Library of Iowa), Joseph F. Shubert (New York State Librarian Emeritus and chair of the Steering Committee), Tom Sloan (State Librarian, Delaware State Library, Chair of the COSLA Research and Statistics Committee), Diana Ray Tope (Data Coordinator, Georgia Public Library Services), and Barratt Wilkins (State Librarian of Florida COSLA).

Also present for parts of the meeting were Laura Riley Aneckstein (Census), Howard Harris (RMG Associates), Roz Korb (NCES), Joan Michie (WESTAT), and Kim Miller.

(1) Introductions of New Members and Others

Mr. Shubert welcomed Ms. Nevins and Ms. Tope, new members of the Steering Committee. Members and guests introduced themselves.

(2) Chair's Remarks and Agenda

Mr. Shubert noted that the Survey, the State library agencies, and the Steering Committee are at an important juncture. Significant changes in leadership and organization in Federal agencies concerned with library services and statistics, and enactment of the new LSTA will have an impact on the Survey. He thanked members for responses to Kim Miller's August 22 e-mail requesting recommendations for the agenda.

After reviewing the draft agenda mailed August 29, the Committee made no changes in the agenda.

(3) NCES' View of the StLA Survey at Year Four and Work Needed

Ms. Kindel described the progress in the Survey as "remarkable." She recalled the 1992 and 1993 planning and noted that the cooperation of the State Library agencies and work of others enabled NCES to follow the timeline projected in 1993. She said that NCES recognizes

the importance of State Library agencies and is committed to the survey for the long term and it to its continuous improvement. She commented on response of the states, improvements over the period, work undertaken this year, and projected work.

In noting that two E.D. Tabs have been published and that the third Report (State Library Agencies, FY 1996) will be released in 1998, she commented that it normally takes 6 to 10 months to secure data from each of the states and DC. For instance, data submissions from State Departments of Education for a similar survey of education data (un-related to libraries) last year took about nine months from the mailing of instrument to receipt of the data from all states.

In the case of the FY 1996 StLA data, NCES mailed the survey instruments in October 1996, and NCES received the final 51st submission on September 8. This is two and half months earlier than the 51st submission of the FY 1995 data). Ms. Kindel also remarked on the early electronic posting of StLA data.

She introduced Ms. Aneckstein, who is completing studies of (1) the extent of duplication of data in the StLA survey and data which states had submitted to the U.S. Department of Education for LSCA purposes, and (2) income and expenditure data. NCES is reviewing a draft of her reports (which are likely to be adjudicated in December). NCES will furnish the final reports to the Steering Committee so that the Committee can evaluate her recommendations at its February 1998 meeting.

Ms. Kindel said that NCES will arrange for other evaluations of methodology and reliability and validity of StLA survey data, as it does for other NCES surveys. She invited Steering Committee discussion of areas of needed improvement. She reiterated that NCES is using the latest technology for administering the survey and making its results available.

(4) Public Policy Interest in State Library Agencies and use of StLA Data

The Committee discussed state library agencies and public policy questions related to their functions, roles, accomplishments, governance, organization, financing, and use of federal funds. Throughout the discussion, the Committee commented on StLA Survey reports which may (or may not) be helpful as state and federal officials, public administration and policy researchers, and library sectors deal with such questions. In closing the discussion, the Committee identified state and federal officials, library sectors, and public administration and policy researchers as customers of the Survey. Questions included:

[Functions] What are state library agencies? What do they do and why? Do their functions need to be carried out at the state level? If not, should those functions be carried out at a different level of government?

[Governance] What significance is there in the location of a StLA in its state government? How do location in the executive or legislative branch or status as an independent board/commission affect the size, scope, operations, performance, and level of support of a StLA? Does a specific StLA carry out its functions

efficiently as compared with the other StLAs or groups of StLAs? How do salaries for StLA personnel compare with others?

[Functions Related to Internet and Information] To what extent does and can a StLA help the people of a state benefit from access to the Internet, to government information, and to information generally? For what purposes? What is the growth of peoples' Internet access in the states? Is there a State interest in using libraries to address its interest in economic development and education? If so, what role might the StLAs carry out in this regard? How will the FCC discount program responsibilities affect the roles of StLA? What are StLA doing with e-rates? What factors support e-rate decisions? How are e-rate efforts being staffed by StLAs? How do the StLAs relate to state-based universal service funds?

[Functions Related to Education] What impact does or should a StLA have on education in a state? How do the various types of school, public, academic, special libraries and library systems relate to the StLA and other state government agencies? What are alternatives to current arrangements? Is there StLA collaboration with higher education, particularly in automation and networking, statewide contracts, resource sharing, etc.? How are StLA and their partners using education/distance learning opportunities and technology? Is it important for the StLA to provide primary leadership for school library media center (SLMC) services; where is a state's SLMC supervision and development responsibility most effectively located in a state's government?

[Telecommunications/Accountability] How does the StLA figure into state information/telecommunication policy and accountability/performance measures and indicators? How do Federal programs such as LSTA and FCC oversight of telecommunications discounts affect StLAs and the people of their states?

[Funding] How are StLAs funded? With what results? Do federal funds displace state funds for support of StLA? If so, have they done so at the expense of assistance to local libraries? Is the StLA the best agency for channeling limited Federal funds? What are trends in support of StLAs and sources of their funding? How significant are funds other than those from regular state and federal appropriations (earmarked funds, special revenue, fees, etc.) in the financing of StLA? To what extent to "parent agencies" support the StLA?

[Federal Impact] How has Federal legislation affected StLA development and services? Do changes in the Federal law enable more libraries to participate in Federally-assisted programs?

[Duplication of Services] Do the library functions of a StLA un-necessarily duplicate those of other libraries in the capital city and elsewhere? What StLA functions relate primarily to the government of the state, individuals, and organizations (including the several types of libraries)? Which StLAs have some responsibility for ensuring public access to government information through open records/public access laws?

[Change] What major shifts are taking place in the way that StLAs do business? How is grant administration and financial assistance to libraries changing? Are there more large projects rather than individual grants? More state aid per capita? How do StLAs support libraries in other ways? How are library systems funded?

(5) Results of Education and Technical Assistance and Need for More Timely Reporting and Improved Data

Mr. Sloan expressed appreciation to Mr. Medina for sharing with him the logs showing the status of data submissions by each state. He has posted this information and followed up to encourage submission in cases in which the StLA has missed the deadline. Staff and other Committee members commented on the favorable results of various Chief Officers who are now asking FSCS Data Coordinators to coordinate their responses to the StLA survey.

In his capacity as Chair of the COSLA Research and Statistics Committee and the COSLA member of the StLA Steering Committee, Mr. Sloan provides state librarians additional information and encourages improved and more timely data, and more use of the survey reports. He will continue to do this through use of the COSLA listserv and his COSLA Committee.

Following discussion of problems the StLA may be encountering that delay responses, Mr. Sloan said that he will keep the Chief Officers apprised of the status of the survey, post response information each month, and contact Chief Officers to see if they or their staff need assistance in submitting data.

Mr. Medina will provide to members of the Steering Committee a list of the StLAs with the names of the chief officers and the survey respondents (the StLA staff member who is identified on the FY 1996 return as the individual who completed the survey and to whom questions should be directed).

Subsequently, Mr. Medina suggested creation of awards for the StLA survey program, similar to the Keppel Awards in the FSCS program.

(6) Data Elements Discussion

(6a) NCES Work, Studies, and Decisions since the March 1997 Meeting. Ms. Aneckstein briefly described her work in assessing (1) OMB's concern that duplication exists between NCES and U.S. Department of Education Office of Library Programs data collections and (2) fiscal data relating to StLA income and expenditures [see page 2 above]. She responded to several questions. The Steering Committee expressed interest in seeing and discussing the report in February.

Ms. Chute briefed the Committee on an NCES proposal to develop more consistent definitions and reporting in the six library surveys. In phase I (five months), a contractor would compare the six NCES library surveys for consistent items and definitions and compare

methodological approaches. Subsequent work would (1) identify gaps in library surveys - what public policy issues aren't being addressed? and (2) identify library questions being asked in other NCES surveys: How should they be fashioned? Where should additional library questions be asked in existing NCES surveys?

Ms. Kroe reported on changes that NCES made in the StLA FY 1997 Survey as a result of Steering Committee recommendations in March 1997. She provided copies of the FY 1997 data elements and definitions which have been submitted to OMB for clearance and identified each of the sections changed. NCES submitted the clearance request for approval so that the FY 1997 instrument can be mailed to the states in October.

(6b) LSTA Data Elements. The Steering Committee reviewed a draft set of technology/digitization data elements developed in the FSCS Steering Committee in work sessions September 7-10. The Steering Committee expressed interest in having the following data elements added to the StLA survey (numbers relate to numbered questions on the FSCS draft document):

- * StLA Web Address (13)
- * Types of providers of Internet access (48C to be revised for StLA purposes)
- * WEB server hits - Web hit data (50)
 - % from inside and outside state
 - % of hits from local library to StLA Web site
- * Numbers and types of terminals available to users and staff in the StLA (51-52 to be revised for StLA purposes)
 - [StLA survey needs to collect data about content available on terminals, e.g. union list of serials, other library catalogs, government information locator systems and other state government information, newspapers in full text, periodicals, etc]
- * Access to digital services from outside the StLA (53)
- * Number of digital databases (54A)
- * Number of full text digital titles (54B)
 - [Is the State Library Agency creating digital resources? If yes...
 - Number of digital titles
 - Full Text digital titles
- * Types of digital databases
 - State publications
 - State government information (other than formal publications)
 - [develop list of types of digital resources being developed by StLA]

The Committee also reviewed papers prepared for the September 15-16 ^{Library} ~~Statistics~~ Policy Forum, and suggested reviewing the IPEDS Electronic Services survey for items of interest to the StLA Survey. The Committee also identified other data needs:

- Library reference questions by e-mail
- ILL electronically
- Access for persons with disabilities
- Video desktop conference by or for libraries
- Satellite broadcast

Computers not dedicated to library functions
Outbound hits on Web server
Remote users coming through the library to get to remote services.

The Committee also briefly discussed non-technology/digital data elements (1) as might be suggested by the Vavrek document prepared for the Policy Forum, (2) the tracking of how LSTA may change the StLA grant business as StLA deal with a broader range and greater number of libraries of all types, and (3) new functions relating to contracts for electronic access, database licensing, and resource sharing for the state's libraries.

The Committee returned to discussion of the differences between data which the StLA agencies will report to the IMLS for LSTA compliance/accountability purposes and the data which the StLA reports to NCES for broader public policy concerns. When LSTA plans and reporting systems are in effect, the "LSTA data elements" in the StLA survey may aggregate items reported to IMLS.

The Committee reviewed Table 3 of the State Library Agencies, FY 1995 to identify services that ~~have~~ appear to have an LSCA orientation rather than a LSTA orientation. Some Table 3 items may need to go beyond the yes/no format, securing for some key items such data as FTE staff used, percent of staff time, staff specialization, expenditure, and percent of budget, and trends in state support based on federal investment. Within limited time, the Committee also looked at table 4 [revisit the headers; keep breakout by type of library], and data elements dealing with training needs to be included in Part J - staff [after #135, add staff].

(6c) Fiscal Data Elements. The Committee looked briefly at fiscal data elements with expectation of receiving assistance from the Aneckstein reports for review in February, 1998, and noted the need to review table headings before the February meeting.

6D - Other data elements (Agency Roles, Outputs, Allied Operations). The Committee noted the COSLA statement, "Roles State Library Agencies May Play on the Information Superhighway" to see if it suggested additional data elements.

The Committee discussed an analysis of "allied operations" data in the FY 1995 report, and Mr. Shubert's recommendation for clarification of the definition of "legislative research services." The committee recommended: (1) that data element 41 be changed to "Primary State legislative research services" and (2) the definition read as follows:

Primary State legislative research organization. This operation conducts research, gathers, digests, and analyzes information in a close and confidential relationship with members of the State legislature and their staff.

Note: As an allied service, the organization is distinguished from specialized reference service which a state library agency may provide to government and other users by responding to reference questions from legislative personnel, providing information service, furnishing bibliographic and net search results, and

instructing and guiding users in conducting their research. At the Federal level, the parallel might be the difference between parts of the Library of Congress: (1) The Congressional Research Service, and (2) various reference services and subject divisions of the Library.

Follow-up to Data Elements discussion. Mr. Sloan, Mr. Rowland, and Ms. Nevins will work as a task force to develop by December 1 recommendations for electronic/digital data elements to be considered by the Committee in February.

Mr. Wilkins, Ms. Tope, and Mr. Shubert will work as a task force to develop, by December 1, recommendations for changes throughout the Survey relating to LSCA/LSTA. If the assistance of another Data Coordinator proves needed, Mr. Wilkins will invite Sandi Long of Utah may be invited to join the task force.

(7) Committee Processes

Mr. Shubert reported on his discussions with Ms. Kindel, Ms. Kroe, Mr. Lorenz, and others regarding the March 1997 Committee discussion of "the possible need for a more formal structure for consideration of changes" in the Survey, particularly in relation to staff work and committee work in completing changes after Committee discussion. He complimented Ms. Kroe on her careful work in following up on the Committee's March 1997 recommendations and noted the staff work now in place that will be helpful for the February 1998 meeting.

Mr. Lance asked if the Steering Committee is sufficiently representative. He recommended that more data coordinators be included on the Committee, and limitations be established on the participation of Federal staff. He also recommended that the Committee use processes, by-laws, and standing committees similar to those of the FSCS Steering Committee and that all Chief Officers vote on each new data element and change.

Discussion ensued on the respective roles of Chief Officers, the COSLA Committee on Research and Statistics, the Chair of that COSLA Committee, and the several Chief Officers and others on the StLA Steering Committee. The Prospectus provides for four **representatives of state library agencies** (including the chair of the COSLA Research and Statistics Committee and other chief officers broadly representing different types of organization and governance structure, StLAs which operate a major reference library, large and small agencies, StLA which operate other-than-library functions, and the demography of COSLA with attention to geographical location, gender, tenure and interest in statistics), and representatives of ALA, ASCLA, NCES, NCLIS, and the U.S. Department of Education **Office of Library Programs**.

Discussion acknowledged the growing and useful involvement of data coordinators in gathering data for the StLA Survey, Census involvement in the Survey, and changes in Federal assignment of library functions. Mr. Lorenz pointed out that Jane Williams, Acting Executive Director of NCLIS has commissioned Howard Harris of RMG Associates to review and make recommendations on NCLIS interest, leadership, and action in the area of library statistics.

The Committee has now been operating for four years under the Prospectus and the charge to the Steering Committee as developed in 1992 and 1993. The Committee agreed that that document should be reviewed and updated as needed, particularly in composition of the Steering Committee, procedures for proposing changes in the Survey, and its other processes for advising on the StLA survey.

Mr. Jaques, Ms. Law, Ms. Kindel, Ms. Korb and Mr. Shubert will comprise a task force to review the 1993 Prospectus and charge, by February 1, will make recommendations for change.

(8) Recommendations and Actions

Mr. Shubert reviewed the recommendations and plans of the Committee as developed in this meeting:

1. NCES should clarify the item and definition for allied operations data on legislative research services as recommended on page 7 of these Notes.
2. Mr. Sloan, Mr. Rowland, and Ms. Nevins will work as a task force to develop by December 1 recommendations for electronic/digital data elements to be considered by the Committee in February.
3. Mr. Wilkins, Ms. Tope, and Mr. Shubert will work as a task force to develop, by December 1, recommendations for changes throughout the Survey relating to LSCA/LSTA to be considered by the Committee in February. If the assistance of another Data Coordinator proves needed, Mr. Wilkins will invite Sandi Long of Utah may be invited to join the task force.
4. Mr. Jaques, Ms. Law, Ms. Kindel, Ms. Korb and Mr. Shubert will work as a task force to review the 1993 prospectus and charge and, by February 1, will make recommendations for changes to be considered by the Committee in February.
5. Mr. Medina, Mr. Lorenz and Mr. Sloan will work as a task force to develop recommendations for an award designed to recognize at COSLA meetings early and complete submission of StLA data by the states. They will complete their recommendations by February 1 so that they can be considered by the Committee in February.
6. NCES will provide copies of the Aneckstein reports to Steering Committee members.
7. Mr. Medina will provide to members of the Steering Committee a list of the StLAs with the names of the chief officers and the survey respondents (the StLA staff member who is identified on the FY 1996 return as the individual who completed the survey and to whom questions should be directed).

(9) Other Business and Date of Next Meeting.

The Committee paid tribute to John Lorenz and thanked him for his work in behalf of the Survey, library statistics programs, the state library agencies, and libraries and library users of the nation.

NCES and NCLIS thus far have projected only one one-day meeting of the Steering Committee in 1998, tentatively scheduled for September, 1998. There is need for a meeting in February 1998 to consider data and definition recommendations for the 1998 Survey. We will request Ms. Korb and Ms. Williams to approve funding two meetings, including a meeting in February'.

Ms. Kroe asked for volunteers from the Steering Committee to participate in the adjudication of the StLA FY 1996 report. Mr. Wilkins and Mr. Shubert volunteered, and Mr. Sloan suggested that Jim Scheppke be invited.

The meeting was adjourned at noon on Thursday, September 11.

The Committee will next meet on February 19-20, 1998, likely starting at 2 p.m. on Thursday, the 19th, and completing by 4 p.m on Friday, the 20th.

J. Shubert
StLASEpt97
9/17/97